

From: KarenD Johnson/R3/USEPA/US
Sent: 2/2/2012 12:40:52 PM
To: Jon Capacasa/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
CC:
Subject: Fw: Are you available at 2 to talk with Jon and I?

This is what I sent to Scott, somehow the attachment didn't come through on his response

Karen D. Johnson, Chief

Ground Water & Enforcement Branch

----- Forwarded by KarenD Johnson/R3/USEPA/US on 02/02/2012 12:40 PM -----

From: KarenD Johnson/R3/USEPA/US
To: "Perry, Scott (DEP)" <scperry@pa.gov>
Date: 02/02/2012 12:13 PM
Subject: Are you available at 2 to talk with Jon and I?

We can call you on your 717-783 # at 2 if available

I'm attaching a table we wanted to bring to your attention. data we got from Cabot conflicts with the wells permitted in your data system. There is a difference of about 20 wells in what they say they have. In addition, there are differences in 12 in they type of well (vertical or horizontal). Thought it would make a difference for your permits.

I have identified some discrepancies between Cabot's response and the State data for the gas wells.

The second tab labelled "Wells In State Data not Include" are a list of wells that were not included in Cabot's response, however according to the State data are within the defined boundary.

The first tab is a list of all the wells that Cabot provided and some of the information seems to be in conflict with the State data for those wells.

1. Cabot response included a 4V well, however the API-number associated with this well is the same as the API-number for the State data well labelled 4H. The State data shows both a 4H and a 4 OG well at the same location with 2 different API numbers.

2. The locational information for the TEEL 7 OG WELL seems to be much different than the State provided locational information.

3. The ones highlighted in blue show above 100 foot difference in the Cabot an State locations. This may be due to the datum or other issues related to obtaining the locational information. I think we need to how Cabot obtained each of the locations and the datum used to obtain those locations. Some of the locations match exactly so not sure if their were different collection methods for the different wells.

4, The Cabot response included several wells with a horizontal component to the well that was listed in the State data as a vertical well. Either the State data or the Cabot data is in error.

In addition to the wells identified in the State Order, Ely 7H has also not been completed, according to Cabot

Karen D. Johnson, Chief
Ground Water & Enforcement Branch